DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 583 CG 004 477

By-Hogan, Joe; Markwardt, Frederick C.

Counselor Education in Minnesota: A Status Study.

Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Pupil Personnel Services Section.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 69
Note-60p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.10
Descriptors-*Counseling Effectiveness, *Counselor Certification, *Counselor Evaluation, Counselor Qualifications, *Counselor Training, *Guidance Programs, Surveys
Identifiers-Minnesota

This study is based on national guidelines established by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision but adapted to Minnesota certification standards. This study sheds light on the quality of counselor education in Minnesota, and it clearly points the direction colleges and universities must take if they are to meet the needs of today's schools. Chapter One discusses counselor education and evaluation, including professional accreditation, state accreditation, and counselor education in Minnesota. The design of the study is presented. Objectives, the general plan of study, modifications, and observations are included. General findings related to: (1) philosophy, (2) administrative organization, (3) professionalization of staff, (4) curriculum, (5) practicum, (6) student staff relationships, (7) facilities, and (8) institutional climate are presented. Recommendations for counselor education in Minnesota and issues in counselor education are given. The part-time, full-time dilemma and recruiting are also discussed. (Author/KJ)

ED0 325583

COUNSELOR EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA:
A STATUS STUDY

CG 004477

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Code: FXXXIII-A-3

COUNSELOR EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA: A STATUS STUDY

Report
by
Joe Hogan
Mankato State College
and
Frederick C. Markwardt
Lindbom Associates, Minneapolis

Study Conducted
by

Edgar O. Berhow, Teacher Personnel
Minnesota Department of Education

Reynold M. Erickson, Pupil Personnel Services
Minnesota Department of Education

Dr. Joe Hogan, Counselor Education
Mankato State College

Julius H. Kerlan, Pupil Personnel Services
Minnesota Department of Education

Dr. Frederick C. Markwardt, Lindbom Associates,
Minneapolis (formerly Counselor Education,
St. Cloud State College)

Dr. E. Raymond Peterson, Division of Instruction
Minnesota Department of Education

G. Dean Miller, Pupil Personnel Services
Minnesota Department of Education

A publication of the *Minnesota Guidance Series* prepared with
funds made available under provisions of the
National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title V-A

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES SECTION
St. Paul
1969

INTRODUCTION

In the past few years the Pupil Personnel Section has been concerned about several major areas of their responsibility. They have completed a major state high school research project on the impact of guidance programs on students; developed a theoretical framework for elementary guidance and intiated demonstration projects to implement this theory and conducted this study of secondary counselor education.

This study is based on national guidelines established by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision but adapted to Minnesota certification standards. This is the first such study in the nation and can serve as a model for other disciplines concerned about the input in teacher education. We learned many things from this study and while it sheds light on the quality of counselor education in our state it very clearly points the direction colleges and universities must go if they are to meet the needs in our schools today.

We need now to examine closely the findings and implications of the study and seriously consider how they might be implemented to insure quality counselor education for all who come to the various institutions for preparation for the profession of counseling and guidance in the secondary school.

Pupil Personnel Services

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Chapter I	Counselor Education and Evaluation	1
	Professional Accreditation	1
	State Accreditation	2
	Counselor Education in Minnesota	3
	State Counselor Education Organization	4
	Role of State Department of Education	4
Chapter II	Design of the Study	6
	Objectives	6
	General Plan of the Study	6
	Later Modifications	7
	Observations Concerning Visits	8
Chapter III	Status of Counselor Education in Minnesota	11
	General Findings	11
	Philosophy	13
	Administrative Organization	14
	Professionalization of Staff	15
	Curriculum	17
	Practicum	19
	Student-Staff Relationships	20
	Facilities	21
	Institutional Climate	22
Chapter IV	Recommendations for Counselor Education in Minnesota	23
	General Recommendations	23
	Program Development and Direction	24
	Curriculum	27
	Miscellaneous	28
Chapter V	Issues in Counselor Education	29
	Evaluation and Accreditation	29
	Part- or Full-time Programs	31
	Possible Solutions to the Part-time, Full-time Dilemma	32
	Recruiting for Counselor Education	34
Epilogue		37
References		38
Appendix	A Counselor Education Questionnaire	
	B Comments About Questionnaire	
	C State Secondary Counselor Certification	

Chapter **1**

COUNSELOR EDUCATION AND EVALUATION

Professional training in any given discipline is part of a total educational program, and should be systematically and methodically evaluated. There are two primary methods of evaluation: (1) Self-evaluation, where the institution, or units thereof, look intensively at a given program, in an effort to determine its strengths and weaknesses, to plan action to overcome the weaknesses and to change direction or emphasis if it is felt necessary; and (2) Accreditation, where some outside agency or group examines the program (in many cases using data from the self-evaluation), notes strengths and weaknesses, and provides the staff with recommendations for future growth. Evaluation and accreditation of programs in public education, both secondary and college, have been in existence less than a century.

Accreditation is an attempt to (1) provide information to the general public on institutional programs, (2) improve institutional programs and standards, (3) facilitate transfer of credits from one institution to another, and (4) raise the standards in a profession.

Accreditation is carried on at a national, regional and state level. In the field of education, the national accreditation is carried out chiefly by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).[1] There are six regional organizations involved in general accreditation of educational institutions, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools being the most appropriate for the state of Minnesota. Finally, the state accreditation function rests primarily with the State Department of Education in each of the several states.

There is relatively little formal coordination among the three accrediting agencies, and it is at least theoretically possible for an institution to undergo visitation from each of three groups and receive reports expressing three basically different opinions concerning any given program.

Professional Accreditation

Another approach to accreditation is by professional groups. For example, the American Medical Association accredits medical schools.

[1]A report prepared by Dr. John R. Mayor for the National Commission on Accrediting examined the total picture of accreditation and NCATE's controversial role in this process. The reader is referred to the spring 1965 issue of *School and Society* for a summary of reactions to Mayor's report.

In a slightly different approach, Division 17 of the American Psychological Association (APA) evaluates and publishes a list of approved programs of counseling psychology.

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) has for some time taken an interest in the problem of evaluation and accreditation of programs of counselor education. Initial efforts focused on the development of standards for counselor education programs.

Beginning in April, 1960 ACES initiated a five-year "grass roots" study concerned with development of such standards. Coordinated by a national committee, more than 100 local committees composing a total of about 700 counselor educators, state supervisors of guidance, guidance directors and school counselors studied appraches to professional standards. A progress report, together with reactions, was presented in an American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) program in 1962 (ACES, 1962). A preliminary set of standards was published in 1964 (ACES, 1964). The questionnaire developed and used in this study was based on this version of the standards. A revision of the standards, based on self-study by over 100 institutions, was published in 1967 (ACES, 1967). Other aspects of the development of standards have been reported and are cited in portions of this monograph (Laughray, 1965, Hill, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968).

More recently there has been considerable discussion of accreditation and the role, if any, that ACES, and/or APGA, should play in the process. APGA has established a formal committee, Professional Preparation and Standards (PPS), which has studied the alternative approaches to accrediting counselor education and the pros and cons of each. While preliminary reports have been made to APGA, no official position has been taken. This accreditation as of this time is handled by the broader state, regional and national groups.

State Accreditation

The process of state certification of individuals and state accreditation of institutitons may in many respects appear totally different. In practice, accreditation will determine the institutions of higher education within the state whose graduates will be eligible for certification as teachers, counselors, principals, and the like.

The writers view state accreditation as valuable to the institution being evaluated for three important reasons:

(1) The institution has the opportunity to thoroughly examine its program, particularly as it works toward meeting the specific requirements of the state in its training of educational personnel. For many institutions, it is an infrequent occurrence which requires its faculty to look in depth at a given program, examine its rationale, its goals, its procedures, and its outcomes. It is this very act of sitting down and interacting with others that contributes substantially to the growth of institutional personnel and programs.

(2) The institution, through the accreditation process, has the responsibility to determine for itself if, in fact, it can justify and will offer a program in a given area. It would seem a waste of time and talent for each educational institution within a state to feel compelled to offer programs to prepare each and every educational specialist. It may well be better to offer fewer programs with each receiving more adequate support than could be given it otherwise. Perhaps one institution should not prepare special education teachers—it does not have adequate faculty, facilities, budget. Perhaps another institution should not prepare school administrators for the same reasons. The very fact that the institution is being visited for the purpose of program evaluation permits faculty to look in depth and to raise questions concerning need for a given program. Self-evaluation demands a degree of openness and honesty that is difficult to achieve. Yet, evaluation is important for self-development of the program, and should certainly, as Hill (1966) suggests, be carried out for the purpose of improving what is being done, not simply as "studying" the program to find the facts.

(3) Finally, state accreditation serves as a protection for the people of the state (in this instance, potential clients especially) and a potential insurance for the graduate student who is seeking a job or transfer to another training institution. State accreditation *should* indicate that all approved institutions meet minimal standards in preparing personnel to function as school counselors within the state.

COUNSELOR EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

There are currently eight programs in the state of Minnesota preparing secondary school counselors at the Master's level. In addition, one institution also prepares students in counselor education at the Specialist and Doctor's levels.

Broadly speaking, there are three boards instituted to govern public institutions of higher education in Minnesota. The Board of Regents controls the University of Minnesota and its branches, the State College Board is charged with the control of the six state colleges, and the State Junior College Board controls the 17 Junior Colleges. Administratively, each of these boards is independent of the other two. Each board receives its support directly and separately from the state legislature. Two institutions preparing school counselors at the Master's level are controlled by the Board of Regents, five are institutions controlled by the State College Board, and one is a private college.

Historically, the University had the first formal Minnesota program of counselor education. Approved programs have been in existence from one to eight years. It is difficult to ascertain specifically the numbers of

students in each program, because of the confusion as to who is considered an "active" participant. However, in 1967, institutions graduated from 3 to 24 students each at the Master's level.

Generally, a high percentage of students enrolled in counselor education programs in Minnesota attend on a part-time basis. This means they attend classes while working on a full-time job, usually in the teaching field. A full-time student at the Master's level will take approximately twelve credits per quarter. Most part-time students will take 3 quarter hours of credit during each quarter attended, but many attend at least one summer session and take six or nine quarter hours of credit. (Summer Sessions at seven of the eight institutions consist of two five-week sessions, while one institution offers a single eight-week session.)

One institution currently requires students to attend a minimum of nine quarter hours per quarter for each of the three quarters, while a second institution is strongly encouraging students to register for a course per quarter during the academic year and at least one summer session each year until course work is complete.

STATE COUNSELOR EDUCATION ORGANIZATION

Until the winter of 1965, there was no formal organization of counselor educators in Minnesota. However, meetings were held, typically twice a year, at the request of the Pupil Personnel Services Section[2] of the State Department of Education, to encourage communication among counselor educators and state supervisors. Initially, meetings were concerned with ACES standards. In 1965, a more formal organization was proposed and approved by the counselor educators and Guidance Unit personnel. This organization, the Minnesota Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors (MACES), has met two or three times per year with the meetings consisting of a State Department report plus whatever business was appropriate. While MACES has no formal ties with ACES, a proposal for this type of organization was made in the spring of 1968.

Although upwards of 50 faculty members from the eight institutions have been listed as counselor educators, many of these persons have served a very limited capacity, and for practical purposes, about 25 faculty members could be listed as counselor educators, ranging from a quarter-time to a full-time basis.

ROLE OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The Pupil Personnel Services Section is primarily a consultative agency to public schools in Minnesota. For the past several years, three professional staff members have comprised the section. They develop recommendations for pupil service in schools through advisory commit-

[2]The title of this unit was previously Guidance Unit.

tees. They visit schools, review guidance programs and make recommendations as appropriate to the specific situation. Regulations[1] concerning guidance are very general except for schools participating in Title V National Defense Education Act (NDEA) program. While there is the possibility of withholding a portion of state aid from schools in gross violation of regulations, such action is seldom taken.

The Pupil Personnel Services Section of the State Department of Education has been active in promoting guidance both within and outside the state. They have sponsored workshops, sensitivity training, a major research study of guidance programs, elementary guidance theory and demonstration projects, and a study of guidance needs of students in area vocational-technical schools. They sponsored the present study of counselor education. Members of this unit have initiated and edited a wide variety of guidance publications on such diverse topics as counselor role, career development, apprenticeship training, college information, career planning curriculum, parent-counselor relations, and elementary guidance. Three of these publications have been reprinted by APGA and distributed nationally.[2]

The State Department also has a responsibility to counselor education institutions. Staff members of the Pupil Personnel Services section are available for consultation with institutions to discuss program development. They also have, along with staff from Teacher Personnel Section, the responsibility to review programs of counselor education and make recommendations to the State Board of Education so that gradutes may qualify for Minnesota counselor certification.[3]

In 1961, members of the Pupil Personnel Services Section and the Teacher Certification Unit of the State Department of Education, visited and reviewed all approved counselor education programs in the state. As additional institutions requested program approval, they were visited by the same team. The last program to obtain approval was in the spring of 1966.

---

[1]Administrative Manual for Minnesota Public Schools, Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul, 1966, pp. 3, 149-150, 158.

[2]Readers interested in information concerning specific publications are invited to contact Pupil Personnel Services Section, Minnesota Department of Education, Centennial Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101, for a publication list.

[3]Evaluation of programs within the state is not questioned. See Chapter 5 for discussion of out-of-state program evaluation.

Chapter **2**

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Objectives

The initial impetus for this study developed in the State Department of Education and was pointed toward evaluation of existing counselor education programs. It was decided, however, that it would be possible to achieve several other objectives of general professional significance. Thus, the orientation of the study was broadened.

The objectives for this study were to:

(1) evaluate individual counselor education programs in Minnesota in relation to decisions on official approval of programs for certification purposes.

(2) obtain an overall picture of the status of counselor education in Minnesota in 1967.

(3) develop and test the utility of a self-evaluation questionnaire in the application of the ACES standards to individual institutions.

(4) develop an effective and efficient model to be used in other evaluations of counselor education programs.

The findings on individual institutions have already been communicated to personnel involved. The model for program evaluation has been presented elsewhere (Hogan & Markwardt, 1968). The questionnaire appears in the Appendix.

General Plan of Study

The investigation of counselor education programs was seen from the beginning as being outside the realm of the statistical, quantative, or tightly controlled study. Effective evaluation was seen as hinging upon the judgment of professional personnel. Such judgment is necessarily subjective. With a team of competent observers and with the structured conditions, however, such observations can be reasonably objective, reliable, and meaningful.

The general plan, which was developed early in 1966, provided for three phases. The first phase was the collection of written descriptive reports on each of the eight institutions offering counselor education programs. These reports were prepared by the staff members of each institution.

A common framework for the written reports was considered important to insure adequate coverage and general uniformity in organization. The ACES standards provided the obvious outline but were not stated in a format that would provide guidelines for an evaluation report. It was decided, therefore, that a questionnaire should be developed that would be a translation of the ACES standards. It was also necessary to modify the ACES standards somewhat as they relate more directly to two year graduate programs and the Minnesota programs are basically one year. Hogan and Markwardt constructed the questionnaire during the spring of 1966 for the Department of Education.

The plan called for the questionnaire to be sent to the institution for completion by the local staff and returned to the State Department.

The second phase of the study (following the return of the completed questionnaire) was to be an on site visit to each of the institutions by an evaluation team. The evaluation team was to consist of State Department staff, three consultants from the Pupil Personnel Section and a representative from the Unit on Teacher Education and Certification.

The visit itself was not planned in detail but was to be a flexible session which would focus on the questions team members wanted to raise, any unique or distinctive features of the local program and generally to clarify the data collected with the questionnaire.

The final phase of the study was reporting. Detailed written reports were returned to the administration and counselor education staff of each institution. These reports identified the strengths and weaknesses of the program, as judged by the team members, recommended action to improve the program. These letters were cosigned by the Director of Pupil Personnel Services and the Director of Teacher Certification or the Assistant Commissioner of Instruction.

In addition to the reports to individual institutions a report was prepared for the State College Board, the governing body of the five state colleges included in the study. This report summarized the general findings in the institutions rather than reporting on each individually.

The schedule was to complete all visits during the 1966-67 academic year and all institutional reports by September, 1967. In addition, overall reports dealing with both the overall status of counselor education and with the process of evaluation were planned.

Later Modifications

After the study had been initiated several changes were made in the plan. These changes were responses of the evaluating team to their very early experiences.

Before any visits were conducted, the evaluation team was expanded to include two counselor educators. This addition was made in order to provide representation of professional counselor educators and, thus,

to broaden the perspective, background, and orientation of the team. Further, it was obviously important to have them involved in the field testing of the questionnaire and the experience was vital background to the preparation of this report.

A second change was to expand the visits from one to two days at each institution. The first on-site visit established for one day was an inadequate amount of time to cover the objective so all other visits were scheduled for two days. After the completion of all the visits the team members met on three occasions for over 25 hours to share their observations and develop the framework of each report.

It was deemed important for the team to have contact with the top administrative personnel at each institution. Thus a meeting with the administrative staff (School Dean, Academic Dean, etc.) was arranged in most, but not all institutions. At this time, the general nature of the visit was discussed, the reporting process was clarified and a tentative schedule for the visitation was developed. Such contacts not only were of value in giving the team a feel for the atmosphere and support given counselor education, but in addition initiated and facilitated communication within the institution and appeared to elicit interest in and support for counselor education.

Finally, it was decided to withhold decisions on approval status of programs until local institutions had an opportunity to study the report sent back to them, to react to it in writing and/or in a meeting, and to take corrective action to improve the deficient aspects of the program. This last phase has not been completed.

OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING VISITS

1. The questionnaire served as a useful guide for both the visitation team and the institutional staff. Obviously it gave the institutional staff a framework on which to build a description of their program. Since it provided the basic data concerning the program, considerable time was saved during the visitation process. Further, having the descriptive data in advance enabled the team to focus on areas that seemed important. It is of the utmost importance that the questionnaire be sent to institutions approximately two months prior to the visit, in order to give sufficient time to collect information and to permit staff to interact. It is also important that the team members have the completed questionnaire several days prior to the visit.

2. Contact with higher level administrative officials at the institution appears to be a necessity. It was found that personal contact with these individuals served to emphasize the need for a strong graduate program of counseling preparation and also provided an opportunity for the administrators to raise questions concerning procedures followed at other institutions. It is suggested that some kind of survey questionnaire be developed to be completed by the administrative personnel to determine their attitudes and behavior toward counselor education. This

survey could be completed by a dean, vice-president, and/or president; whoever would be directly involved.

3. The team also felt a need for contact with all counselor education faculty. While sessions with individual staff members are helpful, total group interaction is a necessity. Since most institutions offer part-time programs, using part-time faculty in counselor education, there is a tendency not to involve such people. While it is difficult in many institutions to schedule time so all these staff members are present, it is considered an essential feature of the visit and should take priority over daily schedule.

4. Visits with graduate students provide considerable insight into the program. Selection of these students may be a problem from a practical standpoint since an institution may have few full-time students and the part-time students are typically available only one evening per week. This would, of course, suggest the visitation should be scheduled on a day when part-time students attend evening class. If both full-time and part-time students are available, it is suggested both groups be interviewed by the team. These two groups may very possibly see the faculty from two different points of view, and the effect of the faculty on the student may vary depending on how extensively the student is involved in the program. It is obviously difficult to be sure that given students represent their peers, and their opinion should be cautiously regarded.

5. Visits to the institution's library, as well as the counselor education library of educational-occupational information and testing materials, are vitally important. It was extremely difficult to indicate on the questionnaire all possible types of resources available and the recency of materials. For example, in some instances, *Occupational Outlook Handbooks* were several years old, although this was not clear on the questionnaire. It is also extremely difficult to assess the practical availability and actual use of materials from responses to a questionnaire. Some of this difficulty is clearly the function of the questionnaire and does not necessarily reflect on the reporting by the institutions.

6. It is advisable to examine recordings or observe students in the interview situation. The team felt there was a close connection between the attitudes and orientation of the faculty and the nature of these situations. While observations of such situations revealed variations among the institutions, the responses to the questionnaire and the discussions failed to identify such variations.

7. Regarding the exploration of staff commitment and professional involvement it was found that responses to the questionnaire were often misleading. For example, while an institution might indicate all staff members attend professional meetings, and are involved in professional activities, it might be discovered in group sessions that such activities are extremely limited and superficial. In many respects, staff commitment was determined from an accumulation of responses and reactions to several parts of the questionnaire and group discussions. Exploration of such topics is often threatening, however.

8. Intensive examination of the practicum is a necessity. Practicum is not only the culmination of professional experiences but also the first real experience in the helping relationship for many students. Thus it is necessary to determine the kinds of students involved as clients, the nature of the interviews, the number of contacts, if such contacts can be continued over a period of time, the activities involved in the school setting, the number of clock hours of interviewing and tape listening, the number of clock hours in which the student is required to play tapes or conduct interviews either in a one-way vision setting under direct observation or the use of video taping, and, most important, the nature and extent of supervisory relationships.

Chapter **3**

STATUS OF COUNSELOR EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

The findings in a study such as this are nearly infinite in number. In this section only those findings that relate to the general status of counselor education programs in Minnesota are presented without identifying specific institutions. It is important in presenting them to caution the reader that these findings, as stated here, obviously represent the perceptions of a limited number of observers. Some of these findings are, by their nature, opinion and not based on quantitative measurement and might not be shared by other observers. Further, these findings represent Minnesota in 1967 and in a dynamic profession can quickly become obsolete.

General Findings

(1) Distinctly, the over-riding finding was the uniqueness and individuality of each program. While there were general similarities among programs, probably a result of certification requirements, each program was clearly the function of the particular circumstances and personalities through which it evolved. These individual differences relate to all aspects of the programs: curriculum, administrative policy, procedure, and especially the practicum. The fact of completion of a program in counselor education, therefore, tells little about the experiential background of the individual, needless to say his philosophy, theoretical orientation, concept of counselor role, or practical approach.

(2) The idea of the study was generally well received by personnel within the institutions and with a few exceptions, the staffs willingly completed the written reports and genuinely welcomed the evaluation team.

(3) While the team received a generally favorable reception, the institutions varied in the extent to which they devoted time and energy to the process. Some were quite casual in the amount of staff time given and the number of staff involved.

(4) At the time of the writing of this monograph, formal reactions to the reports returned had been received from four institutions. The evaluation team was favorably impressed with the promptness of these replies and the thoroughness of the attention given

to the reports. However, the team members were concerned that some institutions representatives focused their attention on self justification or rejection of the evaluation process rather than an open and objective approach to the report.

(5) By and large the several institutions could be described as provincial. Each institution was poorly informed about other state programs, had little intercourse with other institutions, and showed only casual interest in the other programs. This orientation obviously contributes to the range of the individual differences between programs.

(6) Most institutions communicated, directly or indirectly, the feeling of autonomy in the development and conduct of their programs. This survey gave little support to the notion that the development and utilization of standards will modify programs until all fit some monolithic model.[1] Of course, the real test will be to survey these same programs after the reports have been received and have had their impact.

(7) The study indicated that there generally was little communication and coordination of effort within the counselor education staff. While there is a close personal relationship among counselor educators in about half the institutions, individual staff members operate quite independently in most institutions and there is little coordinated development and formalization of policies and procedures. For example, only two institutions held regular meetings of the counselor education staff. Others held meetings when someone felt it was essential and would take the initiative in organizing the meeting. These varied greatly in frequency. Obviously, effective communication is not the inevitable result of merely scheduling meetings, but the probability of its taking place without such structure is extremely low.

Coordination and communication between counselor educators as a group and other segments of the institution is at an even lower level. Within the typical institution, the counselor education program functions and evolves without significant interaction with or feedback from personnel in related fields.

The lack of communication severely restricts effective long range development of programs, interferes with continuity, and limits consistency.

(8) The team was strongly impressed with the great range of personal involvement in the profession and commitment to quality in counselor education. This general point will emerge in other sections of the report and here it is sufficient to say that there

[1]Hill (1967, p. 133) has reported concern by some ACES members that standards would prove to be rigid and inflexible, and hamper experimental and innovative programs.

were some individuals and institutions that were thoroughly committed to counselor education and some that gave, at best, lip service.

Philosophy

(1) There was a nearly complete lack of formal statements of institutional philosophy. Two institutions had brief statements, which were labeled philosophy, in catalogues, but which hardly constituted a clear and complete philosophy. Obviously, without such it is impossible to determine whether or not a given program is consistent with institutional philosophy. One implication of this lack is that the several faculties did not consider an institutional philosophy to be essential.

(2) Statements of counselor education philosophy were absent from the materials most institutions submitted for review. It was also clear that there was confusion over what constitutes a philosophy. Further, many counselor educators either questioned or were in clear disagreement with the ACES position that a formal philosophy is needed for an effective program.

Three or four institutions had statements of objectives. (The exact number depended on interpretation). These statements varied greatly in their content and specificity. An absence of such statements would seem to make it impossible to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and leave an evaluation with no criteria for the appropriateness of the various aspects of the program. Further, without such it is difficult to maintain continuity as the composition of the staff changes from year to year in some instances.

One implication of these findings is that counselor educators have felt comfortable about developing and maintaining programs without the backdrop of formal philosophy and objectives. Apparently there has been little concern about evaluation of the effectiveness or about continuity and a willingness to assume that all staff members were agreed on philosophy and objectives.

(3) This survey revealed that over the years only three or four follow-up studies of ex-students had been done. They were not consistently done where they have occurred, and have dealt only at the relatively superficial level of opinions and attitudes. There have been no meaningful studies of counselor behavior on the job.

(4) Most institutions were uncertain as to the philosophical and theoretical positions of their individual staff members and whether or not the various staff members were in agreement in such matters. There was a general feeling that "we understand each other" but discussions during the visits often tended

to refute this. New staff members' theories or philosophies were typically not a factor in their selection. This may have been at least partially due to apparent differences of opinion about staff composition. It is also likely that in some cases there was more concern with merely having someone than with having the right man. Further, since most institutions employ counselor educators to work only part-time in counselor education the importance of the candidate's counselor education qualifications is oftentimes tempered almost to the point of disregard.

Administrative Organization

(1) At the majority of the institutions, higher level administrative personnel were uninformed about the goals and status of counselor education. There was no clear and general explanation for this.

(2) In six of the institutions there was no separate and indentifiable administrative unit that had counselor education as its primary responsibility. Typically, counselor education, was one of a number of responsibilities carried by a department. The department involved varied from education to educational psychology to psychology, or a combination thereof, though in all cases was under the auspices of teacher education.

(3) In only one institution was there a separate budget for counselor education. In five of the institutions, the counselor educators submitted requisitions with little or no assurance that these would be honored, little or no control over which items would be honored, and only a vague understanding of where or on what basis the ultimate decisions would be made.

(4) Counselor education was basically handled as a part-time program. Most institutions did not offer a complete program during the academic year, most of the academic year offerings were in the evening or late afternoon, and most graduate students attended while holding full-time jobs. It was very unlikely that a student could have completed any of the programs by attending fulltime in an academic year and a summer. At the same time, the sentiments of most counselor educators were inclined toward basically full time programs in which students would receive more intensive experiences.

(5) In six institutions the large majority of all staff members devoted only part of their time to counselor education. At only one institution was the majority of the involved staff assigned full time in counselor education. There was only one full time counselor educator among all the other seven institutions. Many personnel carried a wide range of teaching and administrative responsibility outside of counselor education.

(6) In six institutions, even the leader of the counselor education program had responsibilities in other areas.

(7) Investigation of the history of the programs revealed a lack of continuity in the leadership and the development of most programs. There typically had been a high rate of turn-over in staff and leadership. The 'leader' in six of the eight programs had been appointed within the previous three years. Combining this high turn-over with the general lack of statements of policy and procedure could be expected to hamper continuity.

(8) There was a deficiency in the amount of clerical support given the counselor education staff, in most if not all institutions. In many cases a ratio of clerical help to counselor education faculty could not be determined exactly due to the part-time assignments of both. It was clearly below the ACES standard, however.

(9) Normal faculty load, which is broader than number of courses taught, was not clearly defined at any institution and those carried generally were considered to be excessive. Full time teaching varied from 12 quarter credits per academic year to 15 credits per quarter. Graduate advisee loads varied, but ranged as high as over 100 and many carried undergraduate advisees also. The load problem was made particularly acute by the large number of advisees assigned each faculty member. While the exact number fluctuates, it was typically too large to allow the advisor time to develop meaningful and significant relationships with his advisees. The usual range of committee and other assignments was also observed.

Professionalization of Staff

(1) There was great variation among individual counselor educators in degree of involvement in or commitment to the profession. While this variation tended to appear between institutions, great variation also appeared within most institutions. In some cases, institutions utilized personnel in counselor education who were uninvolved professionally, were professionally out-of-date and did not feel committed to counselor education.

(2) Some Minnesota counselor educators have provided significant regional and national leadership. Most, however, did little more than maintain membership in national and state organizations.

(3) There was little involvement or leadership on a local level. Counselor educators did not devote significant effort to local school personnel in such things as local professional organizations, inservice education, consultation, and the like.

(4) The state college system provided extremely little institutional support for professional activity on the part of its faculty

members. During 1967, for example, the out-of-state travel budget allocated to each staff member was between $9 and $10.

(5) There was a great range of interest in and participation in professional publication. Rather than observing a "normal" distribution in number of publications, there tended to be a bimodal distribution with several having a number of publications and even more with none.

(6) There was a general lack of involvement in research except as advisers. This was true even among those counselor educators who were otherwise professionally active. Perhaps this was indirectly related to the fact that students tended to find their own research requirement their biggest hurdle.

The lack of periodic and personal involvement by the staff directly in research communicates to students, not necessarily validly, an indifferent attitude toward research on the part of the faculty member. The counselor educator's research competencies, and therefore his ability to assist his students, also deteriorates without use. Further, research activity by staff provides a situation in which students can gain valuable experience and skills, prior to undertaking their own projects.

(7) It was difficult to determine precisely, but about seven counselor educators engaged in counseling youth on a regular and continuing basis, primarily with college students. Thus, a majority of counselor educators were teaching without a base of current counseling experience with secondary school age youth.

(8) There was little systematic cross-fertilization of thinking between counselor educators and members of other related academic departments. One institution indicated a formal relationship involving members of other departments in interaction with counselor educators.

(9) Counselor educators, as a group, hold membership in the American Personnel and Guidance Association, and the divisions thereof, but not in related organizations such as the American Psychological Association. While counseling rests largely on psychological principles and theories, counselor educators and their students typically did not consider themselves psychologists.[1] This finding on Minnesota counselor educators is consistent with the results of a recent survey of ACES members which reported that 50% of the respondents belonged to APA and one-third to Division 17 (Johnston 1968).

---

[1]Compare Brammer (1968) with reaction by Felix (1968) suggesting current thinking concerning the "counseling psychologist" vs. "guidance" models in practice and indirectly in training of school counselors. See also an earlier proposal by McCully (1962) and Hoyt (1962).

Curriculum

(1) The course requirements leading to endorsement for certification varied to a surprising degree, from a minimum of 72 quarter credits at one institution to less than a master's degree at another.

(2) All programs covered the basic areas identified in the ACES standards, though in different ways and with different concentrations.

(3) While programs are conducted year around, the bulk of the curriculum offerings, at a majority of institutions, were concentrated in the summer sessions, a period when staff availability was erratic. Many counselor educators did not teach full time during the summer, sometimes due to an unwritten institutional policy against all staff being employed throughout the summer session unless the program was self supporting.

(4) Program development typically did not proceed on the basis of a coordinated total staff effort. It was more often the result of a set of more-or-less independent individual contributions.

(5) There has been relatively little experimentation or innovation in either the curriculum or in the teaching process.

(6) There was a distinct and general trend in the direction of extending and intensifying the program. This was paradoxical in that there has been great concern within the state about the shortage of counselors and pressure from a number of directions to produce counselors at a higher rate.

(7) The outcomes of the individual programs have not been rigorously evaluated. It may be in part due to the absence of program objectives and the difficulty of developing research tools to evaluate effectiveness. Counselor educators, who are clearly not alone in this predicament, were apparently willing to rely on their professional judgment for program evaluation.

(8) Policies on the amount and the nature of work that will be accepted in transfer varied. One institution required a total of only three courses in residence and in counselor education only the practicum in residence. Another institution allowed no transfer of credit.

(9) While courses were generally designed to be taken in sequence, students very often did not follow the sequence. For the majority of students, teachers attending part time, the choice was generally to either take a course out of sequence or to substantially delay their progress since they could only enroll in courses which were scheduled during their off duty hours. This was further complicated in that most programs are offered on a part-time basis with only a portion of the courses offered in any

given term. Thus, even the student attending full time would have a restricted range of courses from which to choose.

(10) The core areas, as outlined in the ACES standards, were generally well covered and the peripheral or background courses were by-and-large ignored in the outlined curriculum.

(11) Course titles in several areas were not descriptive of the specific content included. Particular difficulty was encountered in specifying course content in the psychological testing course, since this varied from the administration of individual intelligence tests to group tests to measurement theory. In other words, there was inconsistency to the point where it was difficult for a person evaluating credits of a prospective student or employee to determine what this person had been exposed to in a given course.

(12) Counseling procedures courses were taught as an academic smorgasbord rather than from a single theoretical or philosophical position. A number of positions were presented and the student was encouraged to arrive at his own position. The amount of help he received in this regard varied, with the majority receiving little assistance with integration.

(13) One institution had introduced group counseling courses and two or three others were in the process of developing some type of offering in this area.

(14) In courses on vocations at most institutions, great emphasis was placed on teaching about occupational information and little or no emphasis was placed on vocational development theories.[1] Also, little attention was placed on how the information could be used in counseling and guidance.

(15) Research papers were required by seven institutions but the scope and quality varied greatly. In some institutions library research was quite common while in others only studies involving testing of statistical hypotheses were acceptable.

(16) The research projects were by far the most common stumbling blocks for students, at all institutions requiring them. Many students completed all other requirements except their independent research.

(17) Seminars designed to integrate the students' experiences were conspicuously absent.

(18) Only one institution had a course in its teacher education curriculum that provided an orientation to guidance services for other school personnel.

[1]These findings appear to be in contrast to a survey of counselor educators by Riccio, (1965) suggesting approximately ¼ of the respondents indicated an interest in Vocational Choice, while about 5% indicated an interest in Occupational Information. It is interesting to note parenthetically, however, that the Occupational Information course at many institutions is assigned to the newest staff member, and is a course often avoided by most staff members.

(19) Six institutions taught core courses off-campus where the usual library and laboratory facilities were not available.

Practicum

(1) Practicum credit meant a different kind of experience on each campus and with each supervisor on a given campus. This experience varied in several ways:

a) the emphasis placed on given activities. At one institution there was no structure, at some it was focused on guidance, and in still others was individual counseling.

b) the supervisor's theoretical orientations to counseling.

c) the nature of the clients counseled and the extent of the relationship.

d) the amount of observation and supervision given students.

(2) Most programs met the general requirements for number of hours of counseling stated in the ACES standards.

(3) There was a consistent lack of clearly stated criteria for the evaluation of the performance of the graduate students. Evaluation was handled on a very subjective basis. There were no data on the consistency of evaluation across different raters.

(4) Some institutions were quite cursory in screening students before allowing registration in the practicum. Generally the student who completed the prerequisite course was routinely admitted.

(5) Most institutions reported student-faculty ratios in practicum that were over the five-to-one recommendation of the ACES standards.

(6) Those institutions offering practicum as a field experience generally did little or no field supervision through their own faculty. A few had field supervisors, but generally did little screening in their selection, gave little orientation to them, and had minimal communication with them.

(7) The range of clients counseled in the practicum experience was typically restricted and not representative of the usual school population. In some cases college students were used as clients, in one case Job Corps volunteers made up the bulk of the clients. At best, the clients were high school students who volunteered to be subjects with the understanding that they would be counseled by graduate students in counselor education.

(8) In only two institutions was stress placed on development of continuing counseling relationship between graduate student and client. In the great majority of the situations, clients had only one session with the counselor-in-training. Thus, there

was little exposure to continuing relationships. Further, there was generally little or no control over the type of interviews the graduate student experienced.

(9) Available facilities were often not fully utilized. Campus laboratory schools could provide considerably more experience than they have. In some cases, closed circuit TV facilities were being tentatively explored but in others they were available but not utilized.

(10) The amount of student observation varied greatly. In some institutions students had no opportunity to observe either peers or instructors counseling. At other institutions, students did as much observing as counseling.

(11) The handling of critiquing also demonstrated individual differences in amount and style. In one instance, critiquing was done almost entirely by mail on the basis of tapes submitted by the students. In one institution, the critique sessions discussed tapes made in previous terms. Most often, students and instructors met as a group and listened to portions of recent tapes. These were generally audio, but in a few instances could be video taped. At one institution critiquing was conducted in a group setting immediately following the interview which was both visually observed and audiotaped. One institution made no use of recording equipment.

Student-Staff Relationships

(1) Little or no effort has been expended by counselor educators to actively recruit students for their programs. Opinions were divided as to whether or not it was an appropriate activity. Those who did think recruiting appropriate did not seem to know how to proceed.

(2) Admissions requirements and procedures were consistently clear and generally rigorous.

(3) Counselor educators were not always in control of the evaluation and decision-making process on applications. In some institutions, students were admitted without the counselor education staff being involved.

(4) Most institutions gather extensive data on the scholastic aptitude and achievement of their applicants and were able to describe their students on these characteristics. Few institutions gathered systematic and sound data on any other personal characteristics of their applicants.

(5) Registration in courses was generally possible without permission of or consultation with an advisor.

(6) Personal contacts between advisors and students were infrequent and superficial. This was partially due to the number of

advisees, but often was also a function of the attitudes of both students and staff about the importance of such contacts.

(7) The selective retention process was typically handled informally, was not a total staff process, and was not based on any clearly stated criteria.

(8) The endorsement for certification process was often found to be handled informally. In many cases it was automatic if the student completed the required courses. In only one institution was it a formal counselor education staff decision. In no instance were criteria formally stated.

(9) At most of the institutions there were very limited opportunities for assistantships and none for scholarships. The one institution indicating availability of graduate scholarships also reported that, at the time of the visitation, no counselor education student was receiving financial assistance.

Facilities

(1) The extent and the quality of the facilities for counselor education reflected a general lack of institutional support and commitment. The facilities are characteristically cramped, overcrowded, and often among the oldest on campus.

(2) In half of the institutions, the counselor educators were not officed in the same general area, but were scattered over the campus. This contributed to the lack of coordination among staff.

(3) In two institutions, some staff members did not have private offices. The practice of counseling is unlikely and awkward without private offices.

(4) In most institutions, the facilities generally were too small to accommodate the program comfortably. Observation facilities varied greatly in quantity and quality, but were generally insufficient. Research facilities were basically non-existent in most institutions.

(5) While most institutions had counseling centers for their students, the counselor education programs were not tied in closely administratively or functionally.

(6) There was great variation in the amount and recency of the available occupational information and test files. No institution had a system to keep such files current and comprehensive.

(7) Library holdings were most difficult to evaluate as no institution had an inventory of materials in counselor education.

Institutional Climate

(1) The climate within institutions varied from some quite conducive to development of quality counselor education programs to some that displayed little or no professional vigor and vitality. In the former cases, top administration were interested and supportive and the bulk of the counselor education faculty were professionally alive and strongly committed.

(2) In several institutions, there was under-support administratively and economically, little professional commitment resulting in small and part-time programs, under-support, etc. Where the circle started or where it could be broken was not clear. It was clear that the factors involved tended to perpetuate each other and retard the development of quality programs.

(3) Support was an elusive factor. Whether support or lack of support depended on the nature and stance of the counselor education staff or the biases of administrators or both or some other factor was uncertain in any given case.

(4) Counselor educators reflected a good deal of "ivory-towerism". By and large, they were, at best, infrequently exposed to what was actually going on in the offices of certified counselors in the high schools of Minnesota.

(5) In most institutions, the existing climate did not encourage students to look at themselves as members of the profession, to feel deeply involved in the educational program, or to participate in professional activities.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNSELOR EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

The 'formal findings' of this study and the more subjective experiences during the evaluation process have led to a set of recommendations. These recommendations indicate the authors' thinking on what is needed to improve counselor education in Minnesota. They are not offered in a belief that they provide a panacea for all time on all problems, but with the hope they will serve as a stimulus to serious and extended discussion in Minnesota and other states among both professional and non-professional people concerned about education in general and counselor education in particular. Hopefully, they will help give focus to the continual efforts of counselor educators to improve their programs. Some of the recommendations grew naturally from recommendations made to individual institutions but others of a broader professional nature reflect the thinking of the writers but have the support of the study committee.

General Recommendations

(1) It is recommended that more attention and effort be devoted to formal evaluation of counselor education. Evaluation needs to be a systematic and periodic process. A sound program would involve continuing internal evaluation and periodic evaluation by external groups. The State Department of Education, with its responsibility for program approval and certification of personnel, must initiate formal evaluation periodically. At the same time, however, primary leadership should come from the counselor educators themselves. MACES could play an effective role here. The use of accepted professional standards in the process is strongly recommended. The authors' experience led them to the conclusion that the ACES standards can be quite helpful in analyzing programs and are not likely to force rigid conformity to one philosophy or approach.

(2) It is recommended that counselor educators seek to broaden their range of professional contacts to increase 'cross-fertilization' of ideas and reduce provincialism. Extended contact is appropriate in several directions. First, greater communication among counselor educators, both within and between institutions, would be desirable. This can be fostered in a variety of ways: through regular formal meetings, special projects,

informal or social activities, and the like. Also counselor educators would benefit from greater inter-play with other disciplines, with their students, and with secondary school counselors in the field. It is recommended that counselor educators also broaden the range of their professional identification and active involvement. Counseling is an application of the behavioral sciences rather than a discipline unto itself and counselor educators could profit from greater interaction with other behavioral scientists, particularly psychologists.

(3) It is recommended that counselor educators develop a proposal for an overall state plan for counselor preparation. This is not to suggest that there should be a single philosophy, set of policies and curriculum. It is, instead, the position of the authors that institutions should not be in a position to declare themselves in the "business" of preparing counselors unless there exists sufficient local need to make the program viable and unless there is strong institutional support in budget and personnel. It may well be that not all institutions should offer programs in all areas. The authors doubt that there is sufficient justification for the existence of all of the counselor education programs that are currently functioning in Minnesota. The state has not had an effective approach to coordinating program development. This, of course, is only part of the more comprehensive question of planning and coordinating of all higher education in Minnesota. Counselor educators might provide the catalyst needed for long range planning to begin.

(4) It is recommended that those institutions which have not done so develop a program for full time students. While the authors do not recommend completely eliminating part-time students, it is felt that the programs should be much more strongly geared to full time study. The authors feel that full-time participation in a program by a student should provide the intensive experience needed to have a significant impact on counselor behavior. Also, full time programs are better able to attract strong faculty.

(5) It is clear there is an urgent need to increase the administrative and financial support given to counselor education. It is recommended the counselor educators present the needs of counselor education to administrative personnel. Support could be marshalled from other related programs for improvement of graduate programs generally. The State Department of Education could also lend considerable weight to this position.

Program Development and Direction

(1) It is recommended that counselor education faculties give serious attention to the role of a philosophy in program development and evaluation. Counselor educators first need to

focus on a definition of philosophy as this study revealed considerable confusion around the nature of a philosophy statement. The question has been raised as to whether or not a philosophy is really important, not to say essential, and if so, how it can be used.

(2) Counselor educators should give high priority to the development and continual reassessment of statements of objectives. These statements are essential to the meaningful evaluation of program outcomes and are guideposts in the process of program development and coordination. It is strongly recommended that such statements be developed by the staff cooperatively.

It is further recommended that such formal statements be used to orient prospective new faculty members. This will help candidates evaluate positions and build in greater continuity and coordination to the program. The statements should also be given to graduate students to give them clear long term direction and to acquaint them with behaviors on which they will be evaluated.

(3) It is recommended that counselor educators initiate rigorous evaluations of program outcomes on a regular basis and that such evaluations focus on the professional behavior of graduates and the impact of their behavior on their counselees, their professional colleagues, and the institutions in which they are employed.

The approach to the evaluation of education programs generally has been a survey of attitudes and opinion, most typically those of students who have successfully completed the program.

While such data are of significance, they are based on a biased and restricted sample. Further, such data deal only indirectly, at best, with the hoped for results of the program. Thus, such surveys do not provide an adequate evaluation of a program.

Obviously, evaluation of actual outcomes is an extremely difficult and complex process and will not be possible without first developing more refined measurement procedures. Also, relating long term behavioral changes directly to specific aspects of programs may be a temporarily insoluble problem. Enlightened program development depends, however, on progress in these directions and may rest initially on relatively short term and crude measures, but measures focused on actual behavioral outcomes.[1]

(4) Greater emphasis on innovation and experimentation in program development is recommended. In many institutions staff members seemed to be too engrossed in keeping the ship

[1]The reader's attention is directed to an effort in this direction by Armas W. Tamminen and G. Dean Miller, *Guidance Programs and Their Impact on Students* (1968), published by Minnesota State Department of Education.

afloat and meeting the day-to-day challenges to consider experimentation. Innovation should, of course, be tied to appropriate evaluation to determine its consequences.

(5) It is recommended that institutions recruit and utilize in counselor education only well trained and strongly committed faculty and use them, to the absolute extent possible, full time in counselor education. In the authors' opinion a counselor educator without an earned doctorate in counseling should be the rare exception. This recommendation would logically seem unnecessary, but the present survey indicated that it does suggest a change in practice in at least several of the institutions.

(6) It is recommended that counselor educators within each institution develop definitions of expectations of individual staff members in terms of load, professional activity, counseling, research, and writing. It is assumed that within a given institution the emphasis of each in the load might be defined differently for different staff members. Such statements would be important in recruiting and orienting new faculty, evaluating the performance of existing faculty, insuring a healthy balance within the program, and developing budgets.

(7) It is strongly recommended that counselor educators plan counseling into their schedules. Ideally this would be done, at least some of the time, with high-school-age youth in continuing and deep relationships. The authors do not consider it necessary to maintain counseling relationships at all times but on at least a periodic basis.

(8) It is recommended that counselor educators devote more energy to objective long range planning of programs in relation to counselor role and counselor supply and demand. Generally, planning has not been long range and has not vigorously dealt with either of these related factors.

(9) It is recommended that counselor educators initiate intensive programs to recruit students. This should be done both by individual institutions and for the profession as a whole. In recruiting for the profession MACES might attempt to work with the Minnesota Counselors Association (MCA). Related to this, it is recommended that recruiting efforts not be restricted to teacher education graduates. Students should be recruited on the basis of their potential for counseling and might be considered from any academic background.

This recommendation is made with full recognition that at present in Minnesota, as in most other states, a counselor cannot be legally certificated and/or employed in a public school without holding a valid teacher's certificate with subsequent teaching experience. It is the authors' contention that such a requirement has no substantive base and is discriminatory, as well as grossly unrealistic in light of current demands for

personnel. It is also noted that at present one institution in Minnesota has special approval from the Minnesota Department of Education on an "experimental" basis to educate a small number of persons who have neither had teaching experience nor possess a teaching certificate but who will subsequently be certified as counselors. The authors see this experiment as an important first step in broadening the base from which counselors can be recruited.

(10) It is recommended that counselor educators become involved in developing programs to up-grade counseling personnel already in the field. There is strong basis to believe that such programs would be eagerly received by counselors in the field. These counselors should be involved in designing and implementing such programs.[1]

(11) It is recommended that effort be devoted to designing ways to encourage students to more quickly and thoroughly identify themselves with the counseling profession and involve themselves in its activities.

Curriculum

(1) It is recommended that all institutions develop systems to insure that course content is continuously up-dated and that there is a coordination of the various courses in the program. At the time of this survey, this was done on a very sporadic and informal basis.

(2) It is recommended that programs build in a broader and more fundamental exposure to the behavioral sciences, particularly psychology. While there was generally verbal agreement with the importance of such background, only a few institutions insured that their students had anything more than an introduction, if that. It is recognized that this will mean expansion of existing programs, though this does not necessarily have to be on top. Some of this background could be obtained prior to admission to counseling.

(3) It is recommended that programs be made more flexible to adapt to individual differences in students. While counseling as a profession is built on the concept of individual differences, the counselor education programs in Minnesota provide little or no flexibility. Building in flexibility would require clear definition of expected levels of competence and the development of effective technique for measuring such behaviors. Such a development would not only allow adaptation for individuality but would also be more realistic than the current assumption that completion of 3 credits in a given area insures competence in that area.

[1]Such a proposal has been developed and proposed for funding under the Educational Professions Development Act (EPDA).

(4) It is recommended that the staff within each institution take a more vigorous and coordinated approach to providing practicum experiences. Generally, students need a broader range of experience, a more careful and appropriate selection of clients with whom to counsel, deeper counseling relationships, more opportunity to observe, more intensive supervision and critiquing, and more explicit criteria for their performance.

(5) It is recommended that counselor educators strive for greater depth in their relationships with their students. Relationships to this time have generally been superficial. More intensive relationships would enable faculty to know more about the individual needs of their students, how to reach them effectively, and give them a better basis for evaluating their potential.

(6) It is recommended that counselor educators develop methods to enable students to more effectively negotiate the research requirements and still up-grade their research competencies. The common difficulty students have with research is that they have not developed enough background and experience prior to their research project, but more importantly little planned supervision is provided students with their projects.

(7) It is recommended that each faculty develop organized experiences that will give students opportunity to integrate the learning from various courses. It is too easy for the student to see the courses as unique and independent experiences and never consolidate the experiences into a meaningful network that can be effectively applied to the professional problems that they will face as counselors.

(8) It is recommended that systems be developed within each institution that will insure a record of resource holdings and a constant updating of such holdings.

Miscellaneous

(1) It is recommended that admission, retention and endorsement procedures be studied continuously to insure their relevance, that all significant factors are included, and that the criteria are clearly and generally understood.

For example, counselor educators should strive for more control over registration procedures so each adviser is continuously aware of course work in which his advisees are enrolled. Registration should not be permitted without advisor's approval.

(2) It is recommended that counselor educators develop greater financial support for graduate students who need help. The authors feel this should include coordinated effort to utilize federal money for grants or loans to individual students rather than to support institute programs. It is also felt that counselor educators should work with local school personnel to encourage the development of internship and sabbatical programs.

Chapter 5

ISSUES IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION

The findings and recommendations discussed earlier have continually brought the writers' attention to a number of broad issues in the field. This chapter identifies in brief terms some of these issues and some approaches to them.

Evaluation and Accreditation

Perhaps most basic within the subject of state evaluation of counselor education programs is the question concerning the extent to which approval of a program provides adequate and sufficient basis for certification of its graduates. Within Minnesota if a program receives approval, graduates of that program will be certified, assuming endorsement is given by the most recent administrator and the training institution. The decision concerning whether a given student will be endorsed rests with each training institution, and a student who is refused endorsement by the institution will not be certified by the state.

While it is generally agreed that a state department of education does have the right and responsibility to influence training institutions within its state by granting or withholding approval of programs, the question has been raised concerning whether a state department can or should have the power to regulate programs outside the state if graduates of those programs seek employment in public schools within the first state. Specifically, should the State Department of Education in Minnesota have the right to refuse certification to graduates of a school in, for example, California, if the Minnesota State Department representatives had reviewed the program of the school and found the training was below Minneota certification standards?

The question is of more than academic importance, since figures over the past several years (Murphy, 1967) have shown approximately 40% of secondary school counselors in Minnesota have taken their graduate work outside the state, with figures being essentially the same or higher for new counselors entering Minnesota secondary schools each year since Murphy's study was completed. How does a state insure quality in counselors from other states? Can the state certification personnel be expected to gain a close acquaintance with out-of-state programs? Do they have the right and the resources to evaluate out-of-state programs?

Evaluation of counselor education programs by state certification units from other states would obviously be cumbersome. In addition,

because of differing certification requirements, such evaluation would also vary from group to group. Certainly, a more workable possibility would be some type of national accreditation. Regional accreditation would, to the writers, appear less satisfactory, because of difficulties created when a counselor moved between regions. McCully (1962) and Hill (1968) stress the need for standards and accreditation. Stripling (1968) has raised the question of proliferation of specific program specialists on NCATE accrediting teams. An experimental program involving the assignment of a counselor educator on selected NCATE teams to focus on counselor education programs was proposed, but rejected by NCATE (Strowig, 1968). From a practical standpoint, if NCATE were to include at least one counselor education specialist on each team, and if all the more than 300 counselor education programs throughout the country were to be evaluated by this NCATE approach, almost insurmountable problems would be encountered. It would mean that the total educational program at each institution would need to be evaluated each time such a request was made for a counselor education program. If NCATE is not the logical organization for national accreditation, there are other organizations that might be utilized.

Dickey (1968) has noted that thirty professional organizations do accredit college and university programs in their respective areas. It would appear that a team of counselor educators would be not only more qualified and bring in varied viewpoints, but would communicate better with staff members in evaluating a counselor education program than would a more broadly selected team including at most one counselor educator.

Counseling psychology programs, even though they are often administered within administrative units of education, are evaluated and approved through APA. APA would not be the most logical organization for like procedures within counselor education, but APGA would be. Recent writings have stressed APGA cooperation through NCATE, but have placed no emphasis on APGA itself as the accrediting organization. Is this because of administrative difficulties, and could such difficulties be remedied?

As discussed in Chapter One, APGA has a committee studying accreditation, but as of publication of this monograph, has not taken an official stand. If APGA finds accreditation impossible, what are the possibilities of ACES considering such a task? ACES membership consists primarily of counselor educators in colleges and universities, guidance directors of large school systems, and state supervisors of guidance. What group would be more closely associated with counselors as they are undergoing graduate education and as they function on the job? Might ACES carry out the evaluation for APGA?

One of the chief difficulties revolves about the fact that the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA), the accreditor of accreditors, must recognize any group to officially evaluate counselor education programs. Progress in this direction has been extremely limited.

While the writers would encourage serious consideration of national accreditation, they feel a second possibility is more immediately applicable, more professionally responsible and realistic, and could easily be combined with accreditation should it be developed at a later date. This would be the development of a formal qualifying examination to be administered by each state before any person could be certified as counselor in that state. This method of evaluation has long been in existence in medicine and law. This method has more recently been developed in the field of psychology. In Minnesota, for example, a candidate at a basic or advanced level must take a qualifying examination in psychology administered by a board of psychologists, regardless of the institution where he took his graduate training. These qualifying examinations for counselors would be instituted in each state, covering, as a minimum, areas required for certification in that state. These examinations could be constructed and administered by a group of counselor educators, counselors and guidance directors working in conjunction with the state guidance supervisors.

It would be reasonable that the state designate certain minimum educational prerequisites for eligibility to take the examination. The exact format of qualifications and examinations would need to be worked out by the professional personnel in the state. Reciprocity may be a problem, but unless there could be some kind of national examination, such as those provided by the American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology (ABEPP) it appears most appropriate for each state to require examination of prospective counselors. It is also possible that states having roughly comparable certification requirements and procedures would establish reciprocity.

Obviously, a variety of practical and administrative problems would require resolution. For example, it might be that out-of-state counselors would be given a one-year temporary permit to counsel to provide time in which the examination would be taken. In spite of the problems involved the most defensible approach to determining whether or not an individual has the ability to perform effectively as counselor is to allow him an opportunity to demonstrate his skills under carefully planned and controlled conditions.

PART- OR FULL-TIME PROGRAMS?

The entire question or full- or part-time programs is one that should be seriously considered. Within the state of Minnesota, there is one institution that is attempting to emphasize a full-time program, with students required to enroll for a minimum of 9 quarter hours of work per quarter on an ongoing basis. The remaining seven programs function largely on a part-time basis, with a few (less than six) full-time students.

Many difficulties are presented to the full-time student enrolling in what is essentially a part-time program. He finds it difficult to find courses offered during the day, and he, in effect, becomes a part-time evening school student. He has little interaction with other students

because of the difficulty in scheduling classes. Motivation becomes a problem, since often he proceeds through the year raising to himself questions as to why he is enrolled in a "full-time" program in the first place, when he could gain almost as much by teaching full-time and taking night courses.

From the colleges' viewpoint, full-time graduate programs with few students are difficult to maintain because of heavy expenses. The writers' feeling is that there *must* be a strong college commitment to such a program.

From the faculty viewpoint, the maintenance of part-time programs immediately suggests part-time counselor education faculty, and creates even further problems. The college must offer faculty full-time positions. However, since in most instances each faculty member will teach no more than one course in counselor education each quarter or semester, this means the faculty member will teach undergraduate courses in psychology or educational psychology. Where, then, is the commitment to counselor education? How visible is the counselor education program when courses are not offered, and where faculty are regarded as insructors in general psychology?

The issue becomes a circular matter, since, if there are few students, the college administration does not feel full-time faculty can be hired for counselor education. However, if full-time faculty are not hired, the program will have difficulty establishing visibility, and faculty will be more committed in many cases to undergraduate teaching than to counselor education. Since the program is not visible and faculty does not feel a strong commitment to a graduate program, few students are attracted. And so, the circle begins again.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO THE PART-TIME, FULL-TIME DILEMMA

One of the most realistic difficulties facing the potential full-time student is financing his graduate education. Basically, there would appear to be five approaches to this financing: (1) The use of personal savings, (2) Personal loans from a bank or credit union, (3) Stipends or assistantships from college, private foundation, or governmental source, (4) Sabbatical leave with partial salary from the school system, and (5) Part-time work.

Most students with whom the writers have associated have not been on sabbatical leave, and therefore, have functioned in another manner. However, the problem encountered is that these students will have serious financial difficulties during their period of full-time graduate work unless the spouse is employed full-time.

The writers feel strongly that the problem of finances is one of the most potent factors which keep students away from a full-time program, and the general feeling in Minnesota among counselor educators is that if there were only substantial financial assistance, more academically

able students would be attracted on a full-time basis. This issue may well be tied in with the issue of numbers of institutions offering counselor education programs, since it might be an easier task to obtain ten stipends at one institution than to obtain two stipends for each of five institutions. Graduate programs can function with ten students per class, whereas the enrollment of two students will make little difference in moving from a part-time to a full-time program.

One implication of the above remarks is that graduate students in counselor education have reached the age where they have other financial responsibilities than to simply support themselves. Most are married, have children, and find it extremely difficult to leave a full-time teaching position paying perhaps $7,000 or more to return to a year of full-time graduate work with an assistantship for under $2,000 per year. This reluctance is increased by the fact that the salary increase as a result of obtaining such training is often quite small. The situation suggests to the writers two possible changes in selection of students and in state certification requirements. (1) Revision of state certification requirements to permit persons from non-teaching backgrounds to enter public school counseling, and (2) Revision of state certification requirements to permit persons with teaching certificates to proceed immediately on receipt of a baccalaureate degree to full-time work on a Master's degree, and to be qualified and hired as a full-time counselor in a public school system without teaching experience but with a teaching certificate. Brief examination of each of these suggestions seems appropriate.

Certainly, the idea of permitting individuals to enter public school counseling without a teaching background is not new, and has been a controversial issue. Initially presented formally by Division 17 of the APA (Johnson, 1962), it formed the basis for meetings at the APGA convention in Boston in 1963. While the open controversy has diminished considerably, there is still considerable opposition to hiring counselors in public schools without a teaching background. The writers favor selected groups of liberal arts graduates trained at the Master's level (preferably on a two-year program including an internship in a school system), who would be certifiable to counsel in the public schools. As has been previously noted, one institution in Minnesota is currently training such a group. Such programs would necessitate close cooperation between the training institution and the state department of education, but could benefit the schools not only because of increasing the number of qualified counselors, but perhaps even more important because of the introduction of personnel in the schools whose differing viewpoints may contribute to those of the teachers and others trained in a typical under-graduate teacher-training program. This is not to indicate displeasure with teacher-training institutions, but rather to suggest that it is often helpful to encourage cross-fertilization, and certainly this process is strongly encouraged in the ACES standards.

Most state certification requirements indicate the necessity for one or more years of "successful teaching experience" before an individual can qualify for counseling certification. Is there something magic about

a year of successful teaching experience? Personal contacts with teachers suggest the probability that the first few years of teaching are the most hectic, the most difficult, and very possibly the least likely to show an individual's potential. The writers propose permitting graduates of a teacher-training program to enter graduate work immediately upon completion of their undergraduate work, to complete the program in counselor education, and to be certifiable as a counselor without teaching experience.

It is felt that both suggestions will permit the entrance into the counselor education program of younger students who have not as yet obligated themselves to family responsibilities, and who could more readily attend a full-time, year-long training program with a minimum of financial support. There is even the possibility of encouraging the election of basic guidance courses during the last few credits of undergraduate work, since most institutions permit seniors to enroll for these courses. This will permit students to make some determination whether it would be feasible for them to continue graduate work in this area during the following year.

RECRUITING FOR COUNSELOR EDUCATION

The preceding section is closely associated with the topic of recruiting students to enter counselor education programs. It has been previously noted that little effort is expended in this state to actively recruit graduate students. Enrollment is essentially based on a word-of-mouth process, where a colleague or friend attended a given institution. Obviously, recruiting must be on a more active basis if the two suggestions in the previous section are to be implemented. Recruiting must be intensified within the group of teachers-in-service, among students in high school and college and within other related fields.

Murphy (1967) studied the results of a questionnaire sent to 1100 teachers in Minnesota, attempting to determine their attitudes toward and experiences in the counseling field. While about half the group had at one time considered becoming school counselors and slightly less than half had actually taken one or more courses in this field, only eight percent of the group studied were "presently planning" to become counselors and three percent were actually taking courses toward this goal. Three negative factors emerge as particularly important to teachers who have abandoned their plans to enter counseling: (1) Finances, (2) College class experiences, and (3) Counselor "Image". The first of these factors has been dealt with previously. Comments are appropriate on the remaining two factors and the inter-relationship between them and recruitment.

Certainly, counselor educators are directly involved both in the college courses and in the counselor image. Their attitudes toward counseling and toward their students will be directly reflected in their courses. If they are interested in and enthusiastic about guidance and

counseling, they might be expected to develop courses and classroom interaction which will be stimulating. The "image" they have developed as professional persons and the image they attempt to communicate to their students and colleagues both in the college and in the public schools, will certainly reflect their feelings about counseling. Here, the concept of commitment to counseling emerges again. A college faculty member who is basically committed to general psychology or to undergraduate courses in human growth and development will undoubtedly spend less time and read less professional material in the field of counseling. His classroom preparation in the counseling area is likely to be less adequate, his lack of basic interest will inevitably be communicated to his students and colleagues. It should be added that no attempt is being made to disparage that faculty member whose primary commitment is to an area other than counseling. Rather, it is suggested that the faculty member should not be placed in the position of being looked upon as a limited part-time counselor education faculty member. Programs should be developed to the point where the *primary* commitment of the counselor education faculty should be to counselor education.

Counselor image certainly has a direct effect on recruitment for the field. In the early years of counseling, the counseling position in many schools was given as a kind of reward for years of service to the school and administration or to remove the older or incompetent teacher from the classroom. Little thought was given to the candidate's ability to relate with students, or even to his basic interest in the counseling field. While this approach has generally been eliminated, there continue to be a relatively large number of counselors currently functioning in school systems whose interest in the field and desire to help students and teachers is minimal. These persons hide behind the testing program and maintenance of school records as excuses for being unable to find sufficient time to see students. The writers feel these counselors actually discourage potentially strong students from entering the field. How often are comments heard such as "I'd never go and see him—he doesn't care, anyway," or "He just gives tests and signs schedules".

The development of the recent concept that the counselor should be a significant person to the student and an instrument of change within the school system creates some questions as to whether there are large numbers of counselors who, in fact, do *not* portray the professional image. Some of this may be associated with counselor role, some may be associated with the counselor as he sees himself personally. This is an important area to thoroughly examine, and might assist in reducing future recruiting problems by establishing counseling as a challenging profession, one that needs and attracts top people. This is not in derogation of the many counselors in this and other states who are doing a fine job and who have professional stature in their school and community. There is a time, however, when a profession must objectively examine its public image and take whatever steps are necessary to make sure that it does fit the objectives of the profession.

The problem becomes circular, even as the full-time program problems become circular. From a high school student's standpoint, why should he enter a field that he does not understand or that does not appear to be functioning adequately, and whose members are not held in high regard by the students? From a strong and effective teacher's standpoint, why should he enter a field where he sees members functioning as "flunkies" or spending too much time talking in the coffee room? Fortunately, these statements are completely unfounded in many school systems, but the writers have attended a number of conferences where these examples of poorly functioning counseling and guidance systems have been brought up again and again by participants. Counselor educators need to exert a continuing positive influence on the field *both* by what we say and what we do. Like the high school counselor, the counselor educator must go into the field, he must meet with administrators, counselors, teachers, and parents in the communities his institution serves. He must carry the message that counseling *does* have a purpose and it *can be* a helping profession. Too often counselor educators do not have an adequate working knowledge of what is actually occurring in the field, and such contacts could not only improve their teaching, but also assist local schools in changing the counselor's image in a positive direction.

Counselor education is, hopefully, attempting to encourage good students to enter the program (although as previously stated, a program of active recruitment must be instituted). At the same time, we have an obligation to recognize that there will be students initially enrolling in the counselor education program whose chances of success in working with others are minimal. We should display the honesty and openness, which we say counselors should possess, to sit down with these students and interact with them concerning our doubts, and to indicate our feelings concerning the possibilities of exploring other vocational goals. Is it not better to express doubts early in the student's program and to deal with these doubts openly than to be faced with these same doubts when certification is applied for? Is it not better to express doubts during the training program than to perpetuate in many schools ineffective counseling and concomitantly an unsatisfactory counselor image based upon weak counselors? If counselor educators have a commitment to the field as we should, do we not in this commitment also have the obligation to the principle of vigorous selective retention in our graduate programs?

EPILOGUE

In reviewing this survey the authors have been impressed with the variability of the programs on almost any dimension, policy or procedure. Quality, which is a very elusive concept when the products have not been vigorously evaluated, seemed to vary dramatically, not simply between institutions, but within institutions. In each program there were aspects of strength and other aspects of weakness.

Many of the findings reported have a generally negative interpretation. These could have been stated from a more positive point of view by inverting them, but would not really change the picture and would be focusing on the unusual rather than usual. This report attempted to reflect the picture of what seemed needed in at least some of the programs, but the very nature of saying 'some' or 'most' suggested there were programs that were strong on each item in question.

While the survey suggests that counselor education in Minnesota has considerable room for improvement, there is no base on which to decide whether Minnesota is generally ahead, behind, or is representative of the profession in the development of counselor education. Other studies would be needed for such comparisons, and it is hoped this monograph might stimulate explorations in other states.

At the same time, however, the question of relative status of programs is obviously less important than the question of the absolute status; that is, the comparison of individual programs, or groups of programs, with the standards of the profession. This survey in Minnesota has identified a number of areas in which additional progress needs to be made.

There is considerable overlap of many of the topics considered, although these have frequently been separated arbitrarily for purposes of discussion. It is not possible, in practice, to separate institutional commitment, part-time programs, counselor image, professional growth, or any of the myriad concerns in the field. They are, in fact, all components of a larger picture, and, if the total picture is to improve appreciably, each of the many components must also improve.

It should again be stressed that the total report is based on findings during the 1966-67 school year. There have been positive changes within several programs since that time which may be formally presented at a later date. The State Department of Education has moved ahead in organizing a Task Force on Counselor Supply and Demand as well as a Task Force on Pupil Personnel Services.

Certainly, many projects to expand counselor education and counseling in Minnesota are currently in progress and more are proposed. It is hoped that some of the thoughts and feelings presented in this monograph might provide the basis for further progress both in Minnesota and in other states.

REFERENCES

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, *Counselor Education—Progress Report on Standards.* Washington, D.C., American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. *Standards for Counselor Education in the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors.* American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., 1964.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. Standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors—1967. *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* September 1967, 46, 96-106.

Brammer, Lawrence M., The Counselor is a Psychologist. *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* September, 1968, 47, 4-9.

Dickey, Frank G., What is Accrediting and Why is it Important for Professional Organizations? *Counselor Education and Supervision.* Spring 1968, 7, 194-199.

Felix, Joseph L., Who Decided That? *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* September, 1968, 47, 9-11.

Hill, George E., Meaning, Commitment and Standards in Guidance. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Spring 1965, 4, 105-114.

Hill, George E., The Profession and Standards for Counselor Education, *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Winter 1967, 6, 130-136.

Hill, George E., Self-Study and Self-Evaluations of Counselor Education Programs, *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Winter 1966, 5, 68-72.

Hill, George E., Standards for the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors, *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Spring 1968, 7, 179-186.

Hogan, Joe and Markwardt, F. C., An Approach to Statewide Evaluation of Counselor Education, *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Spring 1968, 7, 299-304.

Hoyt, Kenneth B., Guidance: A Constellation of Services. *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* April, 1962, 40, 690-697.

Johnson, Walter F., (chairman) and others. The Scope and Standards of Preparation in Psychology for School Counselors. *American Psychologist,* March 1962, 17, 149-152.

Johnston, Joseph A., Membership in ACES, *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Winter 1968, 7, 137-142.

Loughray, John W., ed., *Counseling, A Growing Profession,* Washington, American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

McCully, C. Harold, The School Counselor: Strategy for Professionalization. *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* April 1962, 40, 681-689.

Murphy, Herbert E., *A Study of the Secondary Public School Guidance Counselor Supply and Demand in the State of Minnesota.* St. Paul, Minnesota, Minnesota Department of Education, 1967.

Riccio, Anthony, The Expressed Interests of ACES, *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Winter 1965, 4, 61-63.

Stripling, Robert O., Current and Future Status of Accrediting Counselor Education. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* Spring 1968, 7, 200-209.

Strowig, Wray, Accreditation in Counseling, Personnel and Guidance has a "Long Way to Go." *ACES Newsletter,* Spring 1968, 2, p 7.

Tamminen, Armas W. and Miller, G. Dean, *Guidance Programs and Their Impact on Students,* (Contract No. OE-5-85-035 U.S. Office of Education) Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul 1968.

Code: FXXXIII-C-4

APPENDIX A

A QUESTIONNAIRE* ON THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY COUNSELORS IN INSTITUTIONS APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

1966

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ST. PAUL, MINN. 55101

I. Philosophy and Organization

I. Institutional Philosophy

A. Does your institution have a stated philosophy of education? Yes_____ No_____ If so, please attach a copy of that statement.

1. Briefly describe, if possible, the background and positions of the people who developed this statement.

_____

_____

2. When was it developed?_____
3. When has it been formally reviewed?_____
4. What publications, if any, contain this statement?_____

_____

II. Counselor Education Philosophy

A. Is there a formal statement of philosophy and objectives for the counselor education program? Yes_____ No_____ If so, please attach a copy.

1. When was the statement prepared?_____
2. What personnel (give backgrounds or positions rather than individual names) were involved in its development?_____

_____

_____

3. When, if ever, has it been reviewed?_____
4. In its development and review which of the following types of information were considered? (list under each item considered any formal resource materials used)

a. _____ Data on needs of youth in our changing society.

_____

b. _____ Data on needs of education. _____

_____

*Developed under Contract by Dr. Joe Hogan and Dr. Frederick Markwardt for the Department and adapted from the Standards of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 1964.

c. _____ Data on current status of guidance programs personnel. _____

d. _____ Research findings in behavioral sciences. _____

e. _____ Data on status and trends in school organization and administration. _____

f. _____ Other _____

5. What personnel and/or institutions other than your own have been asked to react to the statement?_____

6. Has the statement been formally accepted by the administration of your institution? Yes_____ No_____ If so, when? _____

7. Where would students, faculty and/or other professional personnel encounter this statement? (Catalogs, brochures, etc.) _____

III. Uses of Statements of Philosophy and Objectives

A. In which of the following areas of program development has the statement been of use? (Where it has been of use, briefly indicate the nature of its use.)

1. To acquaint the rest of the institution with the counselor education program. _____

2. To evaluate the general counselor education curriculum. _____

3. To evaluate specific course syllabi. _____

4. To select and orient new staff. _____

5. For in-service development of present staff. _____

6. To select and orient faculty from other disciplines who are involved in counselor education. _____

7. To select students at admission and at evaluation points throughout program. _____

8. To help define staff responsibilities. _____

9. To orient students to program. _____

10. Other. _____

B. Is there an effort to study program outcomes in relation to stated objectives? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. Is there a plan to provide a systematic and continuous study of program outcomes? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe plan briefly. _____

2. Do cooperating schools and agencies participate in this evaluation? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe their participation briefly. _____

3. Do counselors who have been prepared by the program participate in its evaluation? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe their participation briefly. _____

4. What counselor characteristics are studied in evaluating the program? _____

IV. Facilities and Budget

A. Does the counselor education program have its own budget? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, go to No. 1; if no, go to No. 3.

1. Is the amount considered adequate by the counselor education staff? Yes_____ No_____
2. Who decides how the budget will be expended?_____
3. If there is no counselor education budget, what is the next higher administrative unit whose budget includes counselor education? _____
   a. How are budget requests transmitted to this unit?_____
   b. How are the priorities on counselor education requests established? _____

V. Administrative Organization

A. Attach a chart of the organization of the institution to indicate the position of counselor education in the overall structure.

1. Indicate with which, if any, other departments or units the counselor education program has cooperative relationships. In the case of such, briefly describe
   a. The nature of the relationships (formal or informal)
   b. The contribution of the unit to counselor education

2. Are personnel and/or resources outside the institution utilized in counselor education? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please identify them._____

3. Is secretarial staff assigned to counselor education? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:
   a. Is there full-time help? Yes_____ No_____
   b. How many such personnel?
      (1) Full-time_____ (2) Part-time _____
   c. What is the ratio of clerical staff to faculty in counselor education? _____

II. Staff

A. Responsible leader of counselor education program.

1. Describe this person's professional preparation. _____
2. Describe this person's professional experience. _____
3. Indicate his professional involvement and leadership. _____
4. What per cent of his time is devoted to the counselor education program? _____
5. What other responsibilities does he have? _____
6. What is his research preparation and experience? _____

B. Staff in Counselor Education

1. List on an attached sheet each additional staff member teaching courses required for certification or advising counselor education students, the per cent of time devoted to counselor education, the nature of his academic preparation, his professional experience (include experience with secondary age youth), and his contribution to the counselor education program. (Include off-campus personnel who may teach counselor education courses.)
   a. What is the total number of students currently active (this calendar year) in your program? _____
   b. The current student load would be equivalent to about how many full-time students? _____
   c. What is the ratio of full-time staff to full-time students (figure equivalencies)? _____
2. What is the definition of a full-time load for counselor education staff? _____
   a. Is this the same as in other units in your institution? Yes_____ No_____ If no, how is it different? _____
   b. Which of the following factors are counted into load? (in each case, if yes, explain briefly how counted)
      1. Advising (general graduate student advising) _____
      2. Advising on theses _____
      3. Administrative responsibilities _____
      4. Committee assignments _____
      5. Research activity _____
      6. Professional leadership _____
      7. Consulting _____
      8. Other (explain) _____

C. Staff outside counselor education

1. Do you utilize staff from other disciplines? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, list on an attached sheet, with their qualifications and contributions to the program.

D. Do you have off-campus personnel supervising counselor candidates? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. List on an attached sheet, with their qualifications in preparation and experience.
2. To what extent are such personnel involved in the on-campus counselor education program? _____

II. Professionalization of Staff

A. Are staff members active in professional leadership on a:

1. Local level. Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe. _____
2. State level. Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe. _____
3. Regional level. Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe. _____
4. National level. Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe. _____

B. Are staff members engaged in an ongoing research program? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, briefly describe the research program(s). _____

C. Have staff members contributed to professional literature? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please attach list of contributions.

D. Does the institution encourage staff participation in professional activity? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, how? _____

E. Does the institution provide financial support for staff participation in professional activity? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please describe. _____

F. Briefly describe ways in which students are brought into contact with professional organizations. _____

III. Curriculum

A. Program of Studies

1. Attach an outline of courses leading to the Master's degree in counseling.
   a. Indicate graduate offerings applicable to a Master's degree in counseling for each quarter of the current academic year and proposed courses for both summer sessions.
   b. How many credits are required for the Master's degree in counseling?
   c. What courses are required?
   d. How many elective courses included in the program?
2. In what manner is information regarding the program distributed to prospective students?

   If these methods are other than college catalogs, enclose copies of such information.
3. Are course outlines and/or syllabi available for required courses offered by counselor education staff? Yes_____ No_____. If yes, enclose a copy of each outline and/or syllabus.
4. Are course outlines and/or syllabi available for other required courses in the program? Yes_____ No_____. If yes, enclose a copy of each.
5. Are seminars scheduled as a part of the regular program of instruction? Yes_____ No_____. If yes, briefly summarize the content.
6. Are provisions made for working arrangements with other departments? Yes_____ No_____. If yes, which of the following are true (briefly describe each activity).
   _____ a. Periodic staff meetings with other departments on curriculum.
   _____ b. Provision is made in the curriculum for other areas as electives.
   _____ c. Staff members in other disciplines are acquainted with aims of counselor education.
   _____ d. Interdepartmental and interdisciplinary approach are evident in research planning.
   _____ e. Staff members from other disciplines are invited to speak before counseling and/or guidance classes.
   _____ f. Students are encouraged to implement skills in areas other than those required.
   _____ g. Other (specify)
7. Following is a list of areas of information. If opportunities are provided for work in these areas, indicate course name and number and indicate which instructor(s) teach the course during the current academic year and summer sessions. If an area is covered by more than one course, list each course.
   a. Dynamics of human behavior and learning.
   b. Processes of education.
   c. Professional studies in school counseling and guidance.
      (1) Philosophy and principles of guidance.
      (2) Individual appraisal.
      (3) Occupational information and vocational development.
      (4) Counseling theory and practice.

(5) Statistics and research methodology.
(6) Group procedures in counseling and guidance.
(7) Professional relationships and ethics.
(8) Administration and coordination of guidance services.
(9) Supervised experience.
    (a) Guidance activities.
    (b) Counseling.

IV. Supervised Experience

A. Supervised experiences (This category refers to laboratory experiences not to classroom assignments such as visiting a school counseling office. If the latter type of experience is available and required, note should be made of this, and a brief explanation attached).

1. Is provision made for supervised experience other than the counseling practicum? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, what types of activities are provided?

	Lab	Practicum
_____ a. Tape listening.	_____	_____
_____ b. Preparation of case studies.	_____	_____
_____ c. Preparation of occupational information.	_____	_____
_____ d. Observing counselor-student interviews.	_____	_____
_____ e. Conducting group guidance activities.	_____	_____
_____ f. Teaching a vocational unit.	_____	_____
_____ g. Organizing college or career days.	_____	_____
_____ h. Maintaining cumulative records.	_____	_____
_____ i. Other (specify)	_____	_____

2. If answer to question 1 is yes, indicate the length of time (both weeks and clock hours) students spend in schools as well as provisions made for seminar-type meetings to discuss laboratory experiences.

3. In what settings are students assigned for laboratory experiences? (Check more than one if appropriate)
   - _____ a. Public elementary schools.
   - _____ b. Campus elementary schools.
   - _____ c. Other elementary schools. (specify)
   - _____ d. Public high schools.
   - _____ e. Campus high schools.
   - _____ f. Other high schools.
   - _____ g. College counseling centers.
   - _____ h. Other settings. (specify)

4. Are outlines provided students concerning goals and procedures of laboratory experiences and counseling practicum? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, enclose a copy of the outline.

5. Is a counseling practicum required of all students? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, answer the following:
   a. Practicum setting (check where appropriate)
      - _____ 1. Public elementary schools.
      - _____ 2. Campus elementary schools.
      - _____ 3. Other elementary schools.
      - _____ 4. Public high schools.
      - _____ 5. Campus high schools.
      - _____ 6. Other high schools.
      - _____ 7. College counseling centers.
      - _____ 8. Other settings (specify)
   b. What provisions are made for placement of part-time students who may be teaching or working in some other capacity?

c. Are provisions made for small group work with youths as part of the practicum experience? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, explain.

d. Are provisions made for systematic contacts with parents? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, explain.

e. Approximately how many clock hours of counseling contacts does a student have during practicum?_____ How many of these hours are observed?_____

f. How many weeks are required for practicum students to be enrolled in the practicum course?_____ How many hours per week are required of small group and individual tape listening and critiques?_____

g. What provisions, if any, are made for students who fail to meet staff requirements at the end of the regular practicum time?

h. Has staff developed a set of criteria on which students are judged before final practicum evaluation is made? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, enclose a set of these criteria.

i. How many tape recorders are assigned the counselor education staff for practicum use?

j. Is other audio-visual equipment available and used for practicum? Yes_____ No_____ If so, specify.

k. How are clients recruited for practicum? _____

l. What kinds of students are used as clients? (Check more than one, if applicable):

_____ 1) College bound.
_____ 2) Vocational or trade school bound.
_____ 3) Students entering the job market on graduation.
_____ 4) Potential dropouts.
_____ 5) "Problem" students referred by teachers.
_____ 6) Discipline cases.
_____ 7) Other (specify).

6. Practicum supervision

a. Name staff members who supervise counseling practicum.

b. How many times during the academic year and summer is practicum offered?

c. Name supervisors in schools where practicum students are placed during the current academic year, plus a brief description of their training and professional experience.

d. What is the student-staff ratio in the practicum group?

e. What provisions are made with school systems for released time for supervisors to work with practicum students?

V. Student-Staff Relationships

A. Procedures for Selection and Retention

1. Indicate which of the following criteria are used by the counselor education staff to evaluate students applying for admission to the program. If they are used, briefly state in what manner. Circle those that are different from the graduate school requirements.

   _____ a. Capacity to do graduate level work.
   _____ b. Familiarity with objectives of the program.
   _____ c. Potential for developing effective relationships with youth, school staff and parents.
   _____ d. Potential for engaging in research.
   _____ e. Other (specify).

2. Are these criteria periodically reviewed?_____ If so, describe process briefly. _____

3. Are these criteria available to prospective students? Yes_____ No_____ Are these criteria available to staff members in other disciplines? Yes_____ No_____

4. Summarize undergraduate areas from which currently enrolled students have been drawn.

5. Are staff members available to confer with prospective students concerning the counselor education program? Yes_____ No_____

6. Briefly describe the manner in which decisions are made for admission to the program. Who makes these decisions?

7. Are candidates required to present evidence regarding their characteristics from school administrators?_____ If so, when? _____

B. Procedures for Selective Retention

1. Who assumes responsibility for removal of candidates whose academic qualities and/or personal characteristics are considered to be in conflict with institutional or professional standards?

   _____ a. Dean of college or school.
   _____ b. Department chairman.
   _____ c. Director of counselor education program.
   _____ d. Individual staff members.
   _____ e. Administrator where student has practicum.
   _____ f. School practicum supervisor.
   _____ g. A group of persons (specify).
   _____ h. Other (specify).

2. Is the student assisted in gaining self-understanding as he progresses through the program? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, specify procedures used.

   _____ a. Conferences with staff.
   _____ b. Group meetings with other students.
   _____ c. Counseling contacts with college counseling staff.
   _____ d. Counseling contacts with other professional persons (specify).

3. Does staff meet to discuss progress of individual students? Yes_____ No_____ If no, how is selection made?

C. Endorsement and Placement

1. Does the staff have a written policy concerning procedure for formal endorsement? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, has this been approved by proper administrative authority? Yes_____ No_____

2. Which of the following decide on endorsement for certification?

   _____ a. Dean of the college or school.
   _____ b. Department head.
   _____ c. Director of counselor education program.
   _____ d. Individual counselor education staff members.
   _____ e. Counselor education staff as a group.
   _____ f. Other (specify).

3. Which of the following is used to determine eligibility for endorsement? (More than one may be checked).

   _____ a. Graduate average.
   _____ b. Grades in specific counseling courses.
   _____ c. Satisfactory completion of practicum.
   _____ d. Personality characteristics.
   _____ e. Other (specify).

4. Who signs the endorsement form?_____

5. How are counselor education staff members involved in placement of students?

   _____ a. Work through placement office at the institution.
   _____ b. Directly attempt to place students.
   _____ c. Provide leads for students.
   _____ d. Complete recommendation papers for students.
   _____ e. Work closely with students to determine school and student needs.

D. Follow-Up Program

1. Are periodic (systematic) contacts continued with graduates and schools in which they are working? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, how are these contacts maintained? (Check one or more)

   _____ a. Department newsletter.
   _____ b. Staff visits.
   _____ c. College or university meetings.
   _____ d. MCA meetings.
   _____ e. Other (specify).

2. Has institution conducted follow-up studies of graduates? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, briefly describe the study or attach a summary.

3. Has institution conducted follow-up studies of students who have left the program before graduation? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, briefly describe the study.

E. Are graduate assistantships available to counselor education students? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. How many? _____

2. Do you have a program to recruit and select assistants? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe briefly. _____

3. List, in brief terms, the activities these assistantships involve. _____

_____

F. Is there financial assistance available to students in counselor education? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. Are there part-time work opportunities? Yes_____ No_____
   a. In about how many such situations are students in counselor education given preference in selection. _____

      _____
   b. Is there some person whose official responsibilities include attempting to develop such opportunities and securing students to fill them? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, who and how much time? _____
2. Are loan funds available? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:
   a. About how much money would be available annually in loan funds for counselor education students?_____
3. Are there scholarship funds available? Yes_____ No_____
   a. About how many are available annually?_____
4. Is there a plan to acquaint prospective and new counselor education students with information on financial assistance? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, briefly describe (If a brochure is used, simply attach it). _____

   _____

G. Are personal counseling services available to counselor education students? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. Is such available from staff not involved in counselor education? Yes_____ No_____
2. Are students and staff acquainted with the procedures for obtaining such services? Yes_____ No_____
   a. How is this accomplished? _____

      _____

      _____

VI. Facilities

A. Are there facilities designated for the counselor education program? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. Attach a general floor plan of such facilities.
2. Are there private offices for staff members? Yes_____ No_____
3. Is there work space for clerical staff and assistants? Yes_____ No_____
4. How many counseling rooms are there?_____
   a. How many have observation and listening devices?_____
5. How many class sized observation rooms are available?_____
6. How many conference rooms are available?_____
7. How many portable recorders are available?_____
8. Are other audio-visual aids readily available? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, identify _____
   _____
9. Is there a reference library of occupational-educational materials? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:
   a. About how many current college catalogs are in the file?
      _____
   b. About how many catalogs of other post high school training and educational programs are in the file?_____
   c. Is there a file on military information? Yes_____ No_____
   d. Which of the current commercial sets of occupational information are in this library?_____
      _____
      _____
   e. Which of the reference summaries or guides are available? (i.e.; Occupational Outlook Handbook, College Blue Book, etc.) _____
      _____
   f. What system, if any, is in operation to insure materials are up to date? _____
      _____
10. Is there a reference library of psychological appraisal devices? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:
    a. Does it include interpretative data? Yes_____ No_____
    b. About how many different devices are in this library?
       _____

B. Do you have a listing of library holdings of periodicals and books directly related to counselor education? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please attach a copy.

1. How would you rate the library holdings of current and historical materials in each of the following areas? Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 meaning excellent and 1 extremely deficient. Rate books and periodicals separately.

	Books	Periodicals
a. Guidance	_____	_____
b. Counseling	_____	_____
c. Personality	_____	_____
d. Appraisal	_____	_____
e. Psychology	_____	_____
f. Sociology (and other related disciplines)	_____	_____

2. Are inter-library loans and microfilms available? Yes_____ No_____

3. Are library materials available evenings and weekends? Yes_____ No_____

C. Are counseling center staff and facilities available for use in counselor education program. Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. For observation? Yes_____ No_____
2. For supervised experience? Yes_____ No_____
3. For consultation? Yes_____ No_____

D. Are there research facilities for use of staff and students in counselor education? Yes_____ No_____ If yes:

1. Are there established relationships which provide field situations in which to conduct research? Yes_____ No_____
   a. Where are they? _____
   b. Are students routinely informed of this possibility? Yes_____ No_____
2. Are there laboratories in which to conduct research? Yes_____ No_____
3. Are there consultant services available? Yes_____ No_____
   a. Are students routinely informed of this service? Yes_____ No_____
4. Are there calculators available? Yes_____ No_____
5. Is there a computer center available? Yes_____ No_____

APPENDIX B

Comments About Questionnaire

The questionnaire is a reproduction of the content and format of the questionnaire that was sent to the institutions to be filled out and returned prior to the visit by the evaluation team. In examining the reports submitted by the institutions, in discussing the reports within the evaluation team, and in the actual visitations, the authors have devoted attention to the utility of the questionnaire itself. As a result of this experience the questionnaire should be revised for future studies of counselor education.

The overriding conclusion reached was that the questionnaire served as a very useful test in the evaluation process, though it obviously needs to be supplemented by an on-site visit. It was useful in several ways:

(1) It provided a guide and check list for the local staff to use in examining its program and preparing a descriptive report.

(2) It provided a common format for the reports, and thus insured common coverage and organization which greatly facilitated the evaluation process.

(3) It provided a record of extensive routine data which can be collected more efficiently in this manner than through discussion between the team and the local staff. Further, this record can be retained for future reference, either by the visitation team or the local staff as a benchmark in evaluating progress.

(4) It allowed the visitation team to become familiar with the program prior to the actual visits and enabled the team to use its time during the visits most effectively. The team could focus on those aspects not easily presented in a written report and examine areas that needed further clarification.

While the questionnaire proved useful, it was also clear that it could be made more effective through revision. Part of the needed revision is basic format, such as better spacing of items to provide adequate room for recording responses.

Most problem areas or shortcomings, however, were of a more substantive nature and are briefly indicated here:

(1) The section on Philosophy presented particular difficulty. The confusion over the matter of philosophy suggested need for clearer definition as a guide for the local staff. Further, as written, the questions on what reference material was used in developing the philosophy and on how the philosophy statement was used once developed did not provide the team with meaningful information.

(2) Section V in Philosophy, "Facilities and Budget", needs reworking. Facilities are covered later in the questionnaire. Also, the team came to the conclusion that there should be provision to get at the specifics of a recent budget.

(3) The section on professionalization of staff does not provide useful information; more specific details on participation are needed.

(4) To get a picture of staff load, it will be necessary to build in a detailed description of responsibilities, e.g., number of courses taught, number of advisees, committee assignments, administrative assignments, etc.

(5) The section of supervised experience other than practicum was confusing to most. It will be necessary to provide greater definition of the type of experience that should be considered.

(6) Additional items are needed to bring out a description of the local process of curriculum development.

(7) A question should be included to provide a picture of the extent to which staff members are engaged in counseling and, if so, with what types of clients.

(8) Questions are needed which will get at the existence and specifics of operation of whatever steering committee exists within the staff.

(9) The item on course syllabi needs to bring out dates or the development and revision of syllabi.

(10) The section of library holdings provides quite superficial information and needs to be revised. It may be that library holdings cannot be evaluated effectively by this type of approach. The best answer may be to provide a list that samples randomly from possible holdings for the local staff to check against their holdings. Such a list should also include publication dates, since this information is particularly vital with occupational-educational information material. This, however, does not get at the accessability and actual use of the materials, which are of vital importance. Visitation would be necessary to determine these factors.

(11) The quality of graduate student research is not measured by this questionnaire and may have to be done on a sampling basis if at all.

(12) More specific information is needed on criteria for admission and their application.

APPENDIX C

SECONDARY COUNSELOR CERTIFICATION
STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55101

5074 COUNSELORS, SECONDARY SCHOOL

After September 1, 1963, a person employed as a counselor in a Minnesota public secondary school shall hold a certificate based on the following requirements:

(a) Qualifications for certificate

1. A valid certificate to teach in the public schools of Minnesota based upon a Bachelor's degree from an accredited teacher preparing institution.

2. Completion of a program of counselor education leading to a Master's degree or its equivalent (45 quarter hours of graduate work) and endorsement from an institution approved by the State Board of Education.

   (aa) At least one course or its equivalent shall be taken in each of the seven areas listed below:
   Principles and practice in guidance
   Personality structure and mental hygiene
   Measurement and research methods
   Appraisal techniques
   Occupational and training information and material
   Counseling procedure
   Practice in guidance and counseling; and

   (bb) At least one course shall be chosen from the following areas:
   Group Guidance
   Organization and administration of guidance services
   Psychology of learning

   (cc) Not more than six credits earned in courses selected in (aa) and (bb) above may be undergraduate credits.

3. At least one year of successful teaching experience (two or more preferred).

4. Minimum of one year of cumulated work experience outside of education (two or more years of experience in several occupational areas preferred).

(b) Renewal requirements
Certificate may be renewed on evidence of satisfactory experience.

(c) Provisional Certificate

A provisional certificate will be granted to counselors for two years who meet all professional requirements above with the exception of (a) 4. This certificate may be renewed every two years upon the presentation of evidence that the counselor has accumulated 400 hours (10 weeks) of cumulated work experience outside of education. When the counselor has accumulated 2,000 hours (1 year) of work experience, he will be eligible for the counselor's certificate subject to the renewal requirements in (b) above.